



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/597,960	02/23/2007	Per Olof Magnus Magnusson	P19069-US1	8466
27045	7590	04/24/2009		
ERICSSON INC. 6300 LEGACY DRIVE M/S EVR 1-C-11 PLANO, TX 75024			EXAMINER CHACKO, JOE	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2456	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/24/2009 PAPER	

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

# Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/597,960

**Applicant(s)**

MAGNUSSON ET AL.

**Examiner**

JOE CHACKO

**Art Unit**

2456

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 January 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SE/US)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

This office action is in response to the amendments filed on 1/14/2009. Claims 1-16 are pending. Claims 1 and 9 have been amended.

### *Response to Arguments*

1 Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 1 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

2 The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3 **Claims 1-16** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Koskiahde (WO 03/047183 A1) in view of Veerapalli et al. (U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2003/0153325 A1) in further view of Oda et al. (U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2004/0005886 A1)

As to **claim 1**, Koskiahde discloses a system a data unit processing entity (fig.1, 30, home agent) in a data unit transmission network (fig.1) , **said data unit transmission network associated with** a plurality of network nodes (fig.1, 10, mobile node, 20, correspondent node) , said plurality of network nodes **including** routing nodes (fig.1, 30, home agent) and end nodes (fig.1, 10, mobile node, 20, correspondent node), said routing nodes being arranged to route data units over said data unit transmission network in accordance with a routing protocol (pg.6, 22-24), one or more of said end nodes being mobile nodes capable of accessing said data unit

transmission network over more than one link (pg.6, lines 27-32; where mobile node can move from its home network to other links) , said network nodes being arranged to distinguish between a first type routing address and a second type routing address in said data units (pg.2, lines 28-32; where mobile nodes usually have two routing addresses , one which is their home address and the other a temporary address), said first type routing address ( pg.2, lines 28; static home addresses by which a mobile node is always identified) serving to identify network nodes and said second type routing address (pg.2 ,lines 23-30; where each mobile node has a temporary address called a care-of-address which identifies its current location ) serving to allow routing to mobile nodes,

said data unit processing entity comprising:

a decision data memory storing decision data for associating one or more second type routing addresses(pg.7, lines 8-9, care-of-address) for a particular first type routing addresses (pg.7,lines 2-5; where the binding update is received by the home agent and associates the home address of the mobile node to its care-of-address) ;  
a decision part for receiving a data unit that is to be forwarded and for setting a second type routing address ( pg.7 , lines 8-9; care-of-address) in a said received data unit (pg.7,lines 2-4; where the binding update is received by the home agent described the care-of-address) that is to be forwarded,

Koskiahde does not disclose a system with a decision part set in said received data unit that is to be forwarded and on decision data stored in association with said first type routing address in a decision data memory and a management part for said decision data memory, where said management part provides an interface to said decision data memory for modifying said decision data.

In an analogous art, Veerepalli et al discloses a system wherein an operation of said decision part depending on a first type routing address ([0069]; where IP address is provided to the mobile node based on the registration request from a mobile node) set in said received data unit that is to be forwarded and on said decision data stored in association with said first type routing address in said decision data memory ([0071];

where the home agent stores information describing its mobile nodes so that it can route data to the mobile node),

a management part for said decision data memory, where said management part provides **a first** interface to said decision data memory for modifying said decision data ([0058]; where a mobile node may change the information regarding its new care of address using a registration request message),

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art to modify Koskiahde by incorporating a decision part for setting the second type routing address and a management part for said decision data memory as disclosed by Veerepalli et al . The rationale behind this is modification would be that a person of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to combine the prior arts to achieve the claimed invention.

However, Veerepalli et al. does not disclose a wherein **a second interface to a network control function entity allowing said network control function entity access to said decision data memory for modifying said decision data independently from said mobile nodes.**

Oda et al. does disclose a system wherein **a second interface (fig. 4, 401, IP network IF) to a network control function entity ([0085]; CPS) allowing said network control function entity access to said decision data memory for modifying said decision data independently from said mobile nodes.** ([0087],[0088]; gives access to the IP packet where the CPS then decomposes the IP packet and extracts the IP address and the payload )

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art to modify Koskiahde- Veerepalli by incorporating a second interface to a network control function entity such as the CPS access the memory to modify the IP packet as disclosed by Oda et al. The rationale behind this is modification would be that a person of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to combine the prior arts to achieve the claimed invention.

As to **claim 2**, Koskiahde does not explicitly disclose the system wherein said decision data comprises decision rules and decision parameters, wherein said interface is arranged for modifying said decision rules and decision parameters.

Veerepalli et al. does disclose the system wherein said decision data ([0047]; "mobility bindings") comprises decision rules([0047]; where "Care of Address" is used to route the data to the new location of the mobile node) and decision parameters([0047]; where "Lifetime" is the time period for the address will be valid), wherein said interface is arranged for modifying said decision rules and decision parameters. ([0080]; where the home agent can detect and modify the mobility binding of the mobile node)

As to **claim 3**, Koskiahde does not explicitly disclose a system wherein said decision part is arranged to dynamically select one of said second type routing addresses from said decision data.

Veerepalli et al. does disclose the system said decision part is arranged to dynamically select one of said second type routing addresses ([0075]; where the home agent has mobility bindings which contain one or more records for each device) from said decision data. ([0076]; where the inactivity timer tracks the last time communication is received from node and then the home agent makes a decision accordingly)

As to **claim 4**, Koskiahde does not disclose a system wherein said decision part is arranged to perform said dynamic selection for each data unit to be forwarded.

Veerepalli et al. does disclose the system wherein said decision part is arranged to perform said dynamic selection for each data unit to be forwarded. ([0075]; where the home agent has mobility bindings which contain one or more records for each device)

As to **claim 5**, Koskiahde does not disclose a system wherein said interface is arranged to provide a plurality of control functions with access to said decision data memory.

Veerepalli et al discloses a system wherein said interface is arranged to provide a plurality of control functions ([0071]; where the home agent stores information

describing the mobile nodes to control flow of data ) with access to said decision data memory.

As to **claim 6**, Koskiahde does not disclose a system wherein at least one of said control functions is located in one of said mobile nodes.

Veerapalli et al. discloses a system wherein at least one of said control functions is located in one of said mobile nodes. ([0066]; where the mobile node sends a registration request message to the home agent )

As to **claim 7**, Koskiahde does not disclose a system wherein one or more of said control functions are network resource management functions.

Veerapalli et al. does disclose a system wherein one or more of said control functions are network resource management functions. ([0071]; where home agent manages various kinds of resources to manage the network)

As to **claim 8**, Koskiahde does not explicitly disclose the system wherein the network control function is arranged to determine parameters of access links and be modified decision data based on parameter linked to the network,

Veerapalli et al. does disclose the system wherein said network control function is arranged to determine parameters related to access links ([0055]; where IP networks may be the Internet, an intranet, a private IP network) over which said mobile nodes access said data unit transmission network ([0055]; wireless communication system), and to modify said decision data in dependence on said parameters related to access links. ([0055] [0056]; the routing information concerning the different kinds of data across different links)

As to **claim 9**, this is a method corresponding to system in claim 1. Therefore it has been analyzed and rejected based upon system in claim 1.

As to **claim 10**, this is a method corresponding to system in claim 2. Therefore it has been analyzed and rejected based upon system in claim 2.

As to **claim 11**, this is a method corresponding to system in claim 3. Therefore it has been analyzed and rejected based upon system in claim 3.

As to **claim 12**, this is a method corresponding to system in claim 4. Therefore it has been analyzed and rejected based upon system in claim 4.

As to **claim 13**, this is a method corresponding to system in claim 5. Therefore it has been analyzed and rejected based upon system in claim 5.

As to **claim 14**, this is a method corresponding to system in claim 6. Therefore it has been analyzed and rejected based upon system in claim 6.

As to **claim 15**, this is a method corresponding to system in claim 7. Therefore it has been analyzed and rejected based upon system in claim 7.

As to **claim 16**, this is a method corresponding to system in claim 8. Therefore it has been analyzed and rejected based upon system in claim 8.

### ***Conclusion***

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the



shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JOE CHACKO whose telephone number is (571)270-3318. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 7:30am-5pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bunjob Jaroenchonwanit can be reached on 571-272-3913. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/J. C./

Examiner, Art Unit 2456

/Bunjob Jaroenchonwanit/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2456

